

**Minutes
County Road Administration Board
July 8-9, 2004
CRAB Office – Olympia, Washington**

Members Present: Grant County Commissioner Tim Snead, Chair
Asotin County Commissioner Don Scheibe, Vice-Chair
Kitsap County Commissioner Patty Lent
Garfield County Commissioner Dean Burton
Walla Walla County Commissioner Dave Carey
Clark County Commissioner Judie Stanton
Jim Whitbread, Stevens County Engineer
Robert Breshears, Lincoln County Engineer
Brian Stacy, Pierce County Engineer

Staff Present: Jay Weber, Executive Director
Walt Olsen, Deputy Director
Steve Hillesland, Assistant Director
Karen Pendleton, Executive Assistant
Randy Hart, Grant Programs Manager
Al King, Intergovernmental Policy Manager
Larry Pearson, Maintenance Manager
Don Zimmer, Inventory Systems Manager
Rhonda Mayner, Secretary
Susan Cruise, Legal Counsel

Guests: *Keith Muggoch, Ferry County
**Reid Wheeler, Okanogan County

*(*July 8, 2004 only - **July 9, 2004 only)*

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Snead called the County Road Administration Board quarterly meeting to order at 1:05 PM on Thursday, July 8, 2004, at the CRAB Office in Olympia.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Snead welcomed Pierce County Engineer Brian Stacy to the Board and thanked him for serving as a Board member.

Approve Agenda for the July 8-9, 2004 Meeting

Commissioner Burton moved and Commissioner Lent seconded to approve the agenda with no changes. **Motion carried.**

Election of new Chair and Vice-Chair

Chair Snead opened the floor for nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair for the upcoming year.

Commissioner Lent moved to nominate Commissioner Scheibe as Chair and Commissioner Stanton seconded. **Motion carried.** Commissioner Stanton moved and Commissioner Burton seconded to close nominations. Commissioner Lent moved and Commissioner Burton seconded to elect Commissioner Scheibe as Chair. **Motion carried.** Commissioner Carey moved and Commissioner Snead seconded to nominate Commissioner Burton as Vice-Chair. **Motion carried.** Commissioner Lent moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to close nominations and unanimously elect Commissioner Burton as Vice-Chair. **Motion carried.**

Approve Minutes of April 29-30, 2004 CRABoard Meeting

Commissioner Lent moved to approve the minutes of the April 29-30, 2004 CRABoard meeting, rewriting the portion under "Annual Certification" to reflect that the counties receiving conditional certificates by April 2005, and Commissioner Snead seconded. **Motion carried.**

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Weber thanked Commissioner Snead for his past service as CRABoard Chair. He congratulated Mr. Whitbread, Vice-Chair Burton and Commissioner Carey on their re-appointments to the Board and welcomed them back.

Annual Certification – Keith Muggoch, Ferry County

Mr. Weber introduced Mr. Muggoch, Ferry County Engineer/Public Works Director, and refreshed the Board's memory as to the reasons concerning Ferry County's recently issued Conditional Certificate of Good Practice.

Mr. Muggoch stated that the county was in violation of that particular WAC and was in fact unaware of the requirement.

Mr. Weber mentioned that Ferry County was facing an issue common to many small counties, and asked him how many road miles they had. Mr. Muggoch replied about 750. Mr. Weber said that the staff of the county does an enormous amount of public service with limited resources. He reiterated that the issue of notification on the day-labor projects does not reflect the management of crew and staff in difficult times.

Commissioner Lent thanked Mr. Muggoch for attending the meeting and being available for questions.

Mr. Muggoch voiced his appreciation for the assistance of the Board. He advised the Board on the issue of diverted road funds as they come through the legislative session and to be vigilant as to the condition of roads, especially if the property tax initiative passed. Mr. Weber noted that the initiative failed to get the required number of signatures to make the ballot. Commissioner Carey commented that he appreciated Mr. Muggoch sharing his thoughts on diversion and that he felt many counties needed to hear that kind of information.

Resolution 2004-009 Certifying the Master Road Log

Mr. Weber presented Resolution 2004-009 to certify the master county roadlog to reflect the county road system as of January 1, 2004.

Commissioner Snead moved to approve Resolution 2004-009 and Commissioner Lent seconded. **Motion carried.**

Resolution 2004-010 Certifying MVFT Cost Factors

Mr. Weber presented Resolution 2004-010 – certify MVFT cost factors to the Board.

After Board discussion, Vice-Chair Burton moved and Commissioner Snead seconded to approve Resolution 2004-010, which determines each county's fuel tax distribution factor for calendar years 2005 and 2006. Commissioner Carey asked if this was fairly standard or if there were any unusual factors. Mr. Zimmer answered it was usual. Commissioner Lent commented that it was interesting to note the difference between the 1988 and 1998 figures. **Motion carried.**

Mr. Weber noted that these are items that regularly fall to Mr. Zimmer. He notified the Board that Dave Witcher has been working with Mr. Zimmer to prepare the Road Log and he thanked Mr. Zimmer for his efforts and contributions.

Current Budget Status

Mr. Weber reviewed CRAB's current budget status through June 2004. He noted that more detailed information is available on each fund.

CRAB is running deficit variances in many categories due to front loading of Mobility that will decrease as we move into the next fiscal year. On balance the agency is in a positive financial situation.

Chair Scheibe commented that he appreciated the way the budget information is presented.

Mr. Weber notified the Board that staff will be meeting with SACS next week to begin to prepare the budget for the next biennium. Mr. Weber noted that the budget process has been streamlined somewhat and is available on line to anyone interested.

Mr. Whitbread noted that the benefit percentage was very good if it included all benefits. Mr. Weber stated that CRAB's benefit percentages normally run 19-21% historically. He noted that most of CRAB's employees are graduate level engineering and Information Technology people, and that salary level leads to a low percentage if benefits remain constant.

Maintenance Funding Decision Package

Mr. Weber notified the Board that as part of our budget package CRAB intends to pursue a decision package for maintenance management in the amount of \$4.8 million. It will go directly to the counties by a means not yet devised, but favoring a

direct pass-through monitored by CRAB. Counties will need to be in compliance by December 31, 2007. The legislature has maintained that they did not intend not to fund maintenance management.

Request Legislation

Mr. Weber noted that staff will reintroduce the CRABoard population and BARS reporting bills again this legislative session. CRAB will be filing them as Executive Request Legislation, which means they will enter both Houses simultaneously.

Mr. Weber noted that staff will also be filing Executive Request Legislation on RCW 36.75.010(5) to clarify the definition of "County Engineer".

DEPUTY DIRECTOR'S REPORT

County Engineers/Public Works Directors

Mr. Olsen announced the following changes in status of County Engineers/PWD since April 2004:

San Juan County Engineer Jerry Rasmussen has announced his retirement effective July 1, 2004. CRAB has not received official notification from the Board of the vacancy. The position is out for advertisement and Mr. Olsen and Mr. King have reviewed a list of potential candidates.

Lewis County Acting County Engineer William Frare has been appointed as Assistant County Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director, effective June 21, 2004. Mark Cook, Public Works Director, has assumed the duties of County Engineer, effective June 21, 2004.

Jefferson County Engineer Robert Turpin has announced his retirement effective July 1, 2004. CRAB has indications that they will be filling that vacancy from within Jefferson County.

County Visits

CRAB Staff have not completed any Official County visits since the April 2004 Board meeting. However, engineering staff conducted RAP Prospectus and Visual Rating Reviews in all 39 counties during this quarter and had the opportunity to observe and discuss numerous issues with County Engineers and staff during those times. Mr. Olsen thanked the staff for their efforts in completing these reviews. Commissioner Lent asked what is reviewed, Mr. Olsen stated they are looking at proposed projects and giving a visual rating at that time. Staff also takes that time to review the full project and discuss potential design issues and upgrades in order to make the projects more fundable. Mr. Weber noted that each reviewer rates a full region and each project competes for funding only in their region.

State Auditor's Report

CRAB has received three audit reports representing three counties since the April 2004 Board meeting. Specifically:

Chelan County: SAO #66137, issued on February 20, 2004 covering the period of January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002. This report was an accountability audit only and issued two findings, none of which involved County Road Funds. The financial audit was issued earlier.

Yakima County: SAO #66221, issued on March 5, 2004 covering the period of January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002. This report was an accountability audit only and no findings were issued. The financial audit was issued earlier.

Okanogan County: SAO #66945, issued June 22, 2004, covering the period of July 1, 1991 to March 31, 2004. This report was a special audit report on the Conconully Sewer System only and no findings were issued.

Activities

Mr. Olsen reviewed a list of his activities since the April CRABoard meeting.

Mr. Weber suggested a ten minute recess.

Chair Scheibe called the meeting to order at 2:15 pm.

RAP BUSINESS

Mr. Hart repeated Mr. Olsen's thanks to the staff for stepping up and assisting with RAP ratings. He noted that after today's actions by the Board the counties will be determining which projects to submit. Staff will work on building their visual arrays.

Program Status Report

Mr. Hart reviewed a one-page status report, noting that there is only one outstanding project waiting to move in the 1983-1993 project array. There are 964 projects being funded at this time. Commissioner Lent asked what the minus sign in a column means. Mr. Hart explained that it shows projects that have moved from one category to another. CRAB has a total anticipated revenue of \$373 million through the 2005-07 biennium. \$277 million has been expended to date.

There has been \$11.3 million in turnback funds since April 2000. Mr. Hart explained that if this money is turned back into the regions all at once, the normal funding limit would be increased in each region, but if the counties are not aware of this ahead of time they will not present projects that could use this to its full potential. Staff is not recommending that this be done, but just giving the Board the information. Funds are already committed through the 2008-09 construction season. The account balance should begin to drop back down since an increase in 2001. Historically this balance is maintained at approximately \$20 million.

Mr. Hart asked for the Board's thoughts on what to do with the turnback funds.

- Mr. Weber explained that staff strives to put as much money into county projects as possible while maintaining financial stability over time.
- Mr. Weber recommends that the Board be aware that this money is available and that the future fuel tax scenario is uncertain. Since the public tends to purchase less gas when the price spikes, the fuel tax receipts drop. He asked the Board to consider over the next few months how they would like the reserves used.
- Commissioner Lent asked if there was any legislative limit on the reserves. Mr. Weber answered that they have left that to the Board's discretion, unless RAP is discontinued, in which case \$1 million is reserved for the dissolving of the program. He noted that in the Nisqually Quake, CRAB was directed to assist the counties in rebuilding but was not given any additional funding to do so.
- Mr. Whitbread commented that he didn't feel we needed to spend the money simply because we have it. He felt that it was important to look at programs that could get the money out to the counties quickly, possibly 2R projects.
- Mr. King commented that he receives a report from the Treasurer's Office every month that shows that fuel usage has not really changed much even with the recent price increases.
- Mr. Weber stated that the legislature must be satisfied with the performance of this agency and that the best way to do that is to have the programs we administer work effectively at the local level. Although it is difficult to predict future trends, CRAB needs to maintain its financial integrity. One of the best measures to determine what to do with this money is to use the 2R/3R process. The counties already have projects earmarked that they would do if they had the funds. Mr. Whitbread agreed. Mr. Weber pointed out that these projects are no less important to the county programs and can save future RAP funds incalculably.
- Mr. Olsen commented that the Board needs to consider the timing of releasing these funds. It is too late for this year if a 2R/3R program were initiated, but could be started next year. Mr. Weber suggested waiting until the next biennium to consider disbursement of the funds. Mr. Olsen said the counties would need time to adjust their six-year plans.
- Mr. Weber suggested staff look for input from the county engineers before proceeding.
- Commissioner Lent said she agrees with waiting until the next biennium and that the Board and staff need to discuss this with the counties. It also gives the Board the opportunity to set a reserve balance. She suggested CRAB be conservative through this year and then develop the program.
- Mr. Weber suggested that the Commissioners on the Board meet privately with their Engineers, and the Engineers on the Board meet privately with their Commissioners to get their feedback.
- Vice-Chair Burton asked if some of the reserve could be used for accounting issues such as the recent one by the Treasurer's Office that hit small counties particularly hard. Mr. Weber stated that RAP funds are for county roads only and cannot be used to assist a county's general fund, but can be used as a

loan to a county.

Resolution 2004-011 Apportion RATA Funds to Regions

Mr. Hart presented Resolution 2004-011 – apportionment of RATA funds to regions. The resolution apportions the accrued amount of \$4,748,340 now credited to RATA to the regions by the established 2003/2005 biennium regional percentages after setting aside \$142,450 (3%) for administration. Commissioner Lent moved and Commissioner Carey seconded to approve Resolution 2004-011. **Motion carried.**

Resolution 2004-012 Amend Resolution 2004-004

Mr. Hart presented Resolution 2004-012 – to amend Resolution 2004-004 – “Allocating Remaining 10% of Estimated 2005-2007 Revenue to Partially Funded and New RAP Projects”. The amendment is needed because Kitsap County’s proposed NW Newberry Hill Road and Snohomish County’s proposed Broadway Avenue @ Connely projects were both listed and approved for initial RATA funding in Resolution 2004-004 but are urban in federal functional class as per 2000 census data. CRAB Staff recommends replacing those proposals with the next eligible projects listed on the NW and PS region priority arrays: Kitsap County’s proposed Sidney Road, King County’s proposed Mount Si Bridge #2550A and Snohomish County’s proposed Jordan Road Bridge #42; and approving RATA funds in the amounts of \$199,480; \$84,980; and \$212,020 respectively.

Commissioner Snead moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to approve Resolution 2004-012. Discussion following the motion:

- Commissioner Lent asked how the Board is notified that a project has gone from rural to urban. Mr. Hart replied that after a census and other data, the counties report to DOT which roads have moved from rural to urban under federal guidelines and vice versa. DOT sends CRAB a list.
- Mr. Weber noted that staff’s guideline for whether to fund is the date the contract was offered.
- Mr. Carey asked how a county goes about considering what projects could be affected. Mr. Weber replied that this is difficult to predict. He suggested that the Commissioners meet with their engineering staffs and explore these issues. **Motion carried.**

Project Requests - Deviations

Mr. Hart reported on several pending RAP project requests for deviations and scope changes, as well as RAP projects facing design or construction lapsing within one year.

STAFF REPORTS

Information Services

Mr. Hillesland reviewed the graph outlining the Mobility deployment and status of each of the counties.

He noted that there are three possible deployment models: an SQL server, terminal services, and MSDE or “SQL server lite”. Staff sent out two surveys to the counties

asking about their readiness to deploy.

Training is scheduled every other week through the summer and possibly more often in the fall. Lewis and Pierce Counties are running Mobility now and two more are scheduled to deploy next week. Commissioner Lent asked if the goal was to get all 39 counties. Mr. Hillesland said yes, staff would like to retire CRIS eventually. Mr. Weber stated that CRAB will not have the finances or staff to maintain two systems indefinitely.

Mr. Hillesland stated that there have not been any problems with Mobility, everything is running smoothly. Commissioner Lent asked how other states deal with issues like this and if Washington seems to be ahead of the game. Mr. Hillesland said yes and that eventually CRAB may be able to market the program to other entities.

Mr. Whitbread asked if training will be held on the east side, and offered Stevens County as a host site. Mr. Weber noted that staff is operating with one open FTE slot in the IT division, and another one currently being used by Dave Whitcher. CRAB is probably going to have to fill at least one to support Mobility. He anticipates that eventually it will be handled similarly to Eagle Point, and that if training were offered on the east side it would probably be in a more central location.

Mr. Hillesland announced that Jim Ayers, who supports Eagle Point, has visited six counties for training in May and June. Regular classes at the CRAB offices will resume in the fall. Commissioner Lent asked what is Eagle Point? Mr. Hillesland replied that it is a road design software that CRAB holds a contract for and provides free support to the counties.

Mr. Hillesland reported that the information technology department applied for a grant for hardware upgrades for small agencies, and will be receiving \$4,500 to upgrade the office's outdated internet connection.

Intergovernmental Policy Manager

Mr. King reported on his recent activities. He has dealt with over 80 inquiries from the counties on various issues since the April Board meeting. He continues to edit and distribute news articles. In a recent City/County meeting there were some interesting concepts and questions about funding that will be brought up in future forums. He passed around some photos he has received of county staff and projects that he plans to use in an upcoming Power Point presentation. He has attended meetings on Two-Lane Rural Road Safety, noting that they are looking at both short and long-term solutions.

Mr. Weber suggested staff have a brief demo of the web site at tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. King said staff is trying to develop a model for who has what responsibilities in the counties. He is continuing to work with DOT on an urban design trade-offs document. He is also working on a history and overview of "What Makes a County Road".

Maintenance Management – Standard of Good Practice Draft

Mr. Pearson presented the draft Standard of Good Practice for Maintenance Management showing proposed changes based on County Engineer feedback and Ms. Cruise's legal recommendations. He distributed the draft in May and discussed it with the engineers at the WSAC Summer Convention in June. He informed the Board that there is ample time to address county concerns, as the counties have until December 31, 2007 to be in compliance. He listed some of these concerns, including costs, degree of oversight, ability to comply without changing their systems, and misinterpretation of the language.

Discussions included:

- Mr. Whitbread noted several common themes in the comments. He stated that we need to move beyond the issue of unfunded mandates, and come up with a system that does not require extensive reporting or meetings. Physical assets need to be defined. He stated that he feels the objectives are reasonable, and that most of the items are being done by the counties already, there just needs to be an agreement on terms and reporting. He feels there are three categories of maintenance: routine, preservation, and programmed, and that attempting to track routine maintenance is futile as it varies from year to year and is difficult to predict. Mr. Pearson agreed that performance measures for those activities are unlikely. Mr. Whitbread suggested that documentation of work scheduling be eliminated altogether.
- Commissioner Lent asked how engineers train new employees; is there a manual? Mr. Breshears stated that in Lincoln County they use a manual dealing with how to act in certain situations as well as a training program based on mentoring. Commissioner Lent suggested that a manual could address some of these issues rather than having them in the WAC. Mr. Pearson agreed that this is possible. He reiterated that CRAB is looking for general information, not specifics of operations.
- Mr. Olsen suggested that the wording could be changed to reflect that the counties be required to adopt a policy concerning scheduling. Mr. Whitbread suggested that Item 2 in the WAC be changed from "Work activities shall be defined for the significant activities representing the maintenance work to be performed" to "Counties shall prepare activity guidelines and provide a complete description of work activities"; and Item 4 be changed from "Preparation of an annual work calendar and a monthly distribution of work can help document service needs" to "Counties shall prepare a work calendar that shows the monthly distribution of work". Commissioner Lent commented that the Board would then monitor the counties' compliance.
- Mr. Weber suggested the Board take a broad look at the law, which states that CRAB shall develop a Standard of Good Practice and a model program. It does not give us specifics. It also does not require that the counties use the model. Ms. Cruise asked for an interpretation of "model". Mr. Weber replied that it is a tool counties who do not have a formal Maintenance Management System can use to develop one. He suggested that the WAC be general and

administrative, and details be in the model.

- Mr. Weber noted he had requested that the report generated by the Board from that information be included in CRAB's annual report but the legislature is requiring it be sent to DOT, who will make the information available. Mr. King said that there have been several discussions at DOT about the privatization of maintenance, and that one expectation of maintenance management is that it will provide a tool to compare agency work with privatized work.
- Mr. Weber noted that preliminary discussions about catching up to local needs will be included in the next legislative session. He feels that the counties' ability to document maintenance practices will bolster their chances of acquiring a larger share of funding.
- Mr. Whitbread asked if the counties have the ability to report detailed information on maintenance to the Board. Mr. Pearson said yes, as far as dollars go. Maintenance Management brings in the work aspect: what was actually done with the money? Commissioner Lent said the legislature appears to want something similar to a performance audit.
- Mr. Weber suggested that the Board ruminate on the issues and revisit them at the October CRABoard meeting. The Board concurred.
- Commissioner Lent commented that a cover letter can do a lot, by explaining that this is being done to prevent DOT's involvement in the counties' operations and by going into detail about the intentions behind the WAC.
- Mr. Weber stated that he felt it important for the counties to feel that the WAC was of their own creation, and that they were aware that CRAB has asked for and continues to ask for funding.
- Mr. Whitbread asked that the Board consider removing the term "level of service", as that phrase provokes anxiety in many people.

Chair Scheibe suggested that due to the length of the previous discussion, Item 7 on the day's agenda be postponed to the first item of business Friday, July 9, 2004 at 9:00 am. The Board concurred.

Chair Scheibe recessed the meeting at 5:07 pm on July 8, 2004. The CRABoard meeting will resume July 9, 2004 at 9:00 A.M.

County Road Administration Board
Friday, July 9, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The second day of the summer CRABoard meeting was called to order by Chair Scheibe at 9:00 AM on July 9, 2004.

RURAL TO URBAN RECLASSIFICATION

Mr. Weber addressed the Board on issues raised in the process of county roads being reclassified from rural to urban. Because of the time lapse between signing of the RAP contract and the beginning of construction, there are times of census in between and roads can move from one class to another. CRAB's current policy is to fund any roads that are rural as of the date the contract is signed, regardless of later reclassifications. He asked the Board to notify staff if they want to change that policy.

DAY LABOR CARRY-OVER

Mr. Weber addressed the Board on the issue of day labor dollars being carried over from one construction year to the next.

A question on the annual certification form reads: were all dollars spent on projects that are on the annual construction program? If no, there can be several reasons why, such as contract work, winter-over, and day labor. Mr. Weber noted that day labor is a hot topic in the legislature.

The Board conducted a discussion regarding the following issues:

- Mr. Weber asked what if payments are deliberately held over to split the costs between two accounting years. Is this a violation of day labor? Commissioner Snead said yes, Chair Scheibe said no. Mr. Stacy said he feels it depends when materials were received.
- Mr. Whitbread said he did not feel it was a violation. There is a difference between contract labor and day labor. It should be shown on the next year's reports, and the county should amend the previous year's reports. If ER&R produces materials but Roads hasn't paid for them until the next year, it is not an issue. Mr. Olsen agreed, but said deliberate withholding of payment is a different issue. There is fuzzy ground open to interpretation. Mr. King said he saw it as more black and white. Day labor calculations are pretty straight forward.
- Mr. Whitbread stated that there is a big difference between materials, and equipment and labor.
- Mr. Weber stated that staff is not going out and looking for wrongdoing. He advised the Board that they will have to eventually come up with some way of dealing with it.
- Commissioner Lent asked to be refreshed regarding Ferry County's issue with day labor. Mr. Weber replied that their violation was of a more technical nature. If a county has 75% of their day labor allowance being used on one project in one year, CRAB is supposed to get prior notice of that, receive a full file of the costs and accounting, and receives notice at the end of the project, with any adjustments to accounting. Ferry County did not do that. This problem happens easily in small counties. It is in the WAC because unions were arguing over who should police day

labor, and because it is easier to cook the books or have overruns on a single large project than on several small ones. CRAB wrote the WAC to avoid interference by DOT or the legislature.

- Mr. Weber asked Mr. Breshears for input, as Lincoln County deals with a large amount of day labor. Mr. Breshears said if the withholding is deliberate it is not a violation if the project is still open on the annual program. At the bottom of the annual program they put in line items for the county engineer to sign off on various projects. They submit an amended annual program for projects not on it already. To carry over charges just to make day labor limits comply is a clear violation.
- Mr. Weber asked what if the explanation says the project was held over, but not shown on the construction report. What level of explanation should be expected from the county? The Board agreed to discuss that issue another time.
- Mr. Weber said staff would continue to watch this and on county visits put the topic before the engineers and commissioners and let them know expenditures must be on accounted for on the annual program or amended program. If occurrences and amounts appear to be increasing, then staff will bring the issue back to the Board for additional guidance. Staff would like to make sanctions a last resort. Mr. Whitbread suggested CRAB let the engineers know that they are being watched and to make the effort to do the paperwork properly.
- Mr. Weber reminded the Board to remember that staff is looking at figures from the previous year. He suggested watching for patterns in a county. There have been instances where county staff and policy makers clearly know better. Commissioner Carey asked how many counties run under on day labor. Mr. Weber replied that the vast majority are consistently under. Mr. Olsen said most counties focus on maintenance and have extra resources to use on projects.
- Mr. Weber said that 42% is the highest day labor percentage staff has seen, but the legislature believes more counties are operating at the upper limit. Chances of an increase in day labor limits are slim to none if it is left as day labor only. If the definition of a distressed county is used, the day labor limit could be raised.
- Mr. Whitbread said that if a county is adequately staffed for routine maintenance it can do some day labor but not all, and not big projects.
- Mr. Carey stated that the counties should be doing it cheaper for the taxpayers if possible. Mr. Olsen replied that the Associated General Contractors argue they are taxpayers too and should be entitled to some of those government jobs.

Mr. Weber notified the Board that they each have a copy of a memo from the Attorney General's Office regarding the conduct of state agencies and staff during an election year.

Mr. Hillesland and Mr. King gave a brief visual demonstration of the CRAB website.

Meeting adjourned by Chair Scheibe at 10:05 am.

Chairman

ATTEST: _____